

The undersigned attorney left a voicemail message for the Examiner on April 5, 2004, indicating that the grouping of claims was not clear because claims 41-46 depend from claim 34 (directly or indirectly), but claims 41-46 were in a different group than claim 34. The Examiner returned the phone call and left a voicemail message for the undersigned attorney on April 7, 2004, indicating that the dependent claims should be shifted into the same group as includes the independent claim. Thus, it appears that it was intended for the restriction requirement to include the following groupings:

- I. Claims 1-8, 25-30, and 47-50.
- II. Claims 9-24 and 31-46.

Applicant hereby elects to prosecute claims 9-24 and 31-46 (Group II).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4/21/04

By: [Signature]
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256